

Charles Holbrook Library
Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Ave.
Berkeley 9, Calif.

Social Questions Bulletin

VOLUME 43

MARCH, 1953

Number 3

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions; and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decision, not by violence.

1953 MEMBERSHIP MEETING PLANNED

The 1953 MFSA Membership Meeting will be held at Palos Park Community Center (Chicago), Illinois. The Planning Committee, chaired by Rev. Paul Caton, plans this as the Federation's FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION. Since June 24 are the only available summer dates at the center, the Planning Committee recommends these. Palos is a beautiful conference spot under religious auspices, and directed by a Methodist minister, Rev. Paul Sanders. Registration fee is \$3.00. Voting privileges will be accorded all paid-up voting MFSA members, and all are urged to attend. The Center's charge for individual meals and lodging is reasonable. (For all six meals and both nights the cost will be \$10). Rev. John B.

Thompson, Dean of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago, will deliver a keynote address Tuesday afternoon on *Prophetic Religion in the Current Struggle for Peace and Civil Liberties*. Prof. Kermit Eby of the University of Chicago will lead the Wednesday session on *The Church and Economic Life*. Prof. Eby, a Church of the Brethren minister, is former Director of the Department of Research and Education of the CIO, and has served on the National Council of Churches' Commission on the Church and Economic Life. The Planning Committee is inviting other outstanding leaders, and will announce them later. Send in your registration and reservation now for this outstanding MFSA meeting.

IN THE BATTLE FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES

Churchmen Resist the Witchhunt

A storm of controversy has been precipitated by the current investigation of educators and colleges by Congressional committees on un-American activities, and by the statement from the House Committee's Methodist Chairman, Mr. Velde, that a similar investigation of the churches and churchmen might come next. Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., responded to Mr. Velde's statement by introducing a resolution in the House calling for his ouster from the Committee Chairmanship. Mr. Velde's Committee itself repudiated the idea of a probe of the churches or of anything else, unless ordered by the Committee as a whole.

Mr. Velde's own Methodist pastor, Rev. Joseph Albrecht of Pekin, Illinois, spoke against any political investigation of churchmen, saying it would be a "tragedy . . . very dangerous to democracy."

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam defended our American educational system from the attacks inherent in current investigations and linked them to threatened attacks on the free pulpit. "There isn't a man in this country who cannot be ruined overnight by the kind of procedure wherein a lie is released by a responsible committee and given wide publicity . . . If the freedom of the University is denied, the next attempt will be to silence the pulpit . . . Let the educators and the churches of this nation and all who believe in freedom stand together."

House Committee member Jackson of California, backing Mr. Velde's notion as to the "red" menace in the churches, singled out Bishop Oxnam with the charge that he "served God on Sunday and the Communist front the rest of the week." Other Methodist clergymen supported the Bishop. The National Council of Churches warned against the probers and formed a Committee on the Maintenance of American Freedom.

Should the Investigators Be Investigated?

Proposing that Congressmen investigate themselves, Bishop Charles W. Brashares held "That would be a more fertile field for discovering subversive activity."

Dr. Henry Hitt Crane said: "Two things I have noticed concerning this excessive zeal in investigating everybody. One is that the more noisy the witchhunters become, the more it would seem they need investigating themselves, since it turns out so frequently their charges are not so much attempts to reveal the defections of their victims as to conceal their own corruption. Who shall investigate the investigators is the pertinent question to raise."

A similar stand was taken by a leading Catholic layman, President George Shuster of Hunter College. He stated that the nation's educators, instead of being investigated by Senator McCarthy, should investigate the senator and should do so in cool, objective and fearless manner. Senator McCarthy responded to the general effect that his fellow Catholic was following the Communist line!

A Buried Report on Senator McCarthy

Last year the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections investigated certain activities of Senator McCarthy which "looked highly irregular." The Subcommittee issued its 400 page report at the end of the year. The report states: "The record of what took place . . . leaves the inescapable conclusion that Senator McCarthy deliberately set out to thwart any investigation of him by obscuring the real issues and the responsibility of the Subcommittee by charges of lack of jurisdiction, smear, and Communist-inspired persecution . . . In the face of the Senate's 60-0 vote confirming the integrity of the members of the Subcommittee and its jurisdiction to investigate the matters involved, Senator McCarthy continued to reject the invitations of the Subcommittee to appear before it . . ." Senator McCarthy has paid no penalty for his obstruction, but contrast the treatment accorded victim-witnesses called before his committee. The Subcommittee viewed Senator McCarthy's "refusal to cooperate in any way," as "contempt for the rules and wishes of the entire Senate body."

Despite the obstruction, the Subcommittee completed its report, and it throws considerable light on how Senator McCarthy, with a \$15,000 a year salary could deposit \$172,623.18 over a four-year period. Dealing with the Senator's "activities on behalf of certain special interest groups," the Subcommittee reported his receipt of a \$10,000 fee from Lustron Corp., which borrowed heavily from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation before going bankrupt. The Subcommittee also cited the Senator's "acceptance of a \$20,000 favor from the Washington Representative of the Pepsi-Cola company at the very time he was attacking the government for its manner of handling sugar control." That, the committee reported, "makes it difficult to determine whether Senator McCarthy was working for the best interests of the Government, as he saw it, or for Pepsi-Cola."

The report said Senator McCarthy "early in 1950" began following "the line of the China lobby"—or, more accurately, the lobby on behalf of the Koumintang regime on Formosa. The Subcommittee adds: "It was also inferred that Senator McCarthy may have received financial assistance or other considerations from members of this group."

The Senator's apparent tie with the Formosa lobby, may help explain his highly profitable speculation in the soybean futures market. The NY Herald-Tribune of August 16, 1951, reported in its financial section that T. L. Soong, a brother-in-law of Chiang Kai Shek, was among the Chinese living in the US and abroad who had netted \$30,000,000 in soy bean operations. The Subcommittee report on Senator McCarthy says that he received in 1950 a \$10,000 gift from a Mr. and Mrs. Bentley and that he later invested that amount in the soy bean market, with the result that in about 2 months he had "a total realized profit of \$17,354.50!" The Subcommittee asks: "Did Senator McCarthy have confidential information with respect to the trend of the soybean future market? (Just prior to the

transaction in question, the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department of Agriculture conducted an investigation of alleged soy bean market manipulation involving, among others, a number of Chinese traders.)"

What About Mr. Velde?

As for Mr. Velde, on the House side of Congress, there has been no similar official investigation. But Mrs. Agnes Meyer, before her vigorously applauded address at the American Association of School Administrators, did a little investigating of her own. As a result, she found Mr. Velde, along with Senators Jenner and McCarthy, as wanting in the "moral or intellectual qualifications" to investigate our nation's colleges. She cited Mr. Velde's bill in the House, which would require the librarian of Congress to mark all subversive matter in the Library of Congress. She dismissed the proposal as follows: "The man doesn't make sense." Mr. I. F. Stone in his Weekly Newsletter of February 28, analyzed Mr. Velde's proposal arithmetically. There are 9 million volumes in the Library of Congress. If 200 employees could be found who were brilliant enough to go through five volumes a day in the search for subversive matter, it would take them 30 years to complete the project. At the cost of \$4,000 a year per researcher, the project would cost us taxpayers \$240 million. This apparently assumes that no new volumes would be added in the 30-year period of research involved, which would be the only certain way to assure that no new subversive matter got slipped in. Needless to say, it would be no easy task to decide what was or was not subversive. The researchers would have to contend not only with Marx, Lenin and Stalin, but with Thomas Jefferson, who recommended "Wetting the tree of liberty at intervals with the blood of tyrants." They would also have to contend with other architects of the American revolution, which at the time was considered revolutionary and highly subversive of the existing political order. Then there are those who have charged that Freud and Einstein are subversive. And what about the New Testament, with its Song of Mary speaking of the mighty being cast down from their seats, the rich being sent empty away, and the hungry being filled with good things? One can only have the warmest sympathy for researchers required to do the bidding of Mr. Velde in our Congressional Library.

Other Protestant Counter-attacks

Dr. A. Powell Davies of All Souls Unitarian Church in Washington preached a sermon, titled "Study in Tyranny." In it he asked for popular repudiation of Senator McCarthy, Senator Jenner, and Representative Velde, as "pretended patriots . . . men of tyrannous purpose."

Brilliant and equally courageous was the sermon on Washington's birthday by Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Dean of the Washington Cathedral, (Episcopal), who based his remarks on the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness at the hands of the Devil:

"Overawe them, terrify them—and they will follow docilely, was the Devil's suggestion.

"It seems to be Senator McCarthy's, and Congressman Velde's, and a great many others' today—who are demonstrating that they believe God and the nation are best served by the frightened and credulous collaborators of a servile brand of patriotism.

"It comes mighty close to "tempting God" when anyone operates on the assumption that they are the divinely constituted guardians of other men's consciences, other men's patriotism or thoughts.

"Someone has calculated that ten million of our citizens have had their character investigated by one or another of the various agencies of government in the last 10 years—and their fate decided accordingly! Does it succeed best in keeping the enemy out, or in letting inefficiency and waste and corruption in, with nobody the wiser? The Sarnoff report would certainly indicate the latter.

"But the deeper question by far is what all this does to the individual—that little human being upon whom our democracy ultimately rests and whom Jesus said was infinitely precious in the sight of God. What happens to him? Well here is the sort of thing that is happening:

"A man is working in a classified section. His work is secret. He has to have a security pass to get into the place in the morning. One day his pass is revoked. He can't get in. His job is over. Nor can he ever get another job again, when people learn why he lost the last one. Why did he lose his clearance? Nobody knows, least of all himself. It could be simply that his commanding officer didn't like him, was jealous of him, or was prejudiced against a Jew, or maybe someone reported him for reading the *New Republic* or having one of Aaron Copeland's records in his house. I even heard of a man being sus-

pected because of working overtime—he sought the quiet of his desk at night to finish his work, and the mere fact of a light burning over his desk at night made him subject to question.

"So a man's livelihood and whole future is torn unduly from him simply by the picking up of a pass, for which no reason need be given to anyone. How can the poor chap even protest, without further hurting himself by the wide publicity that would result?

"What is this omnipotence that pretends it can ferret out all sin and purify all else? What revelation of righteousness do they claim for the all-pervading power which now they propose to apply not only to public administration but to private education as well?

"*God is thy Judge*—not the Attorney General's list or the the American Legion's or the Roman Catholic Church's or your private list or mine. To seek to usurp the judgment of God is one of the most ancient forms of human sin. It runs all through history from Roman Emperors right down to Mr. Elwood B. Jarnagin, chairman of the Americanism Commission of the local Legion. They are but rash and nasty men who, thinking themselves wiser than God, would not only usurp the power to look into a man's soul, but would then seek to cram their judgment down our throats!"

(Why not write Dean Sayre for the complete text of his important sermon—and send your own word of appreciation and encouragement to him, and to others who are speaking out against encroachments on our freedom?)

Wide opposition to the proposed Congressional investigation of the churches, indicates many persons understand that such investigations will be calculated to intimidate and silence the prophetic ministry, destroy the independence of the Church, and break down the present wall of separation between Church and State. That wall of separation is important to all democratic Americans, and above all to Protestants who understand and appreciate their heritage.

Educators Also Resist

Many have also recognized that investigations stemming from Congress also threaten the independence and autonomy of educational institutions. Further, they create an atmosphere in which academic freedom and courageously honest teaching and inquiry are stifled. Do we want our government to take on the business of thought control, or of running our churches or our schools? Should we entrust our education, any more than our religion, to such men as Mr. Velde or Senator McCarthy? Is thought control or ideological probing a proper pursuit for a democratic government?

Thus the Princeton Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, attacked "inquisitorial procedures" investigating "fitness to teach." The Chapter resolved: "We deplore the failure of many of our educational, religious and political leaders to define the true nature of this growing threat to our intellectual and spiritual heritage and to protest against it . . . Political misuse of legal processes, stifling of controversy, suppression of dissent, banning and censorship of books either because of their ideas or because of what their authors believe, boycotting of the creative mind—these and other methods of control are the most dangerous enemies of a free society."

On March 27, 1953, the 39th National Convention of the AAUP, itself adopted the resolution adopted earlier by its Princeton Chapter. The Association's National Convention also charged that "Loyalty oaths and investigation of schools were inimical to the American way of life." As to dismissal of teachers, the AAUP held: "that the fitness of a college teacher should be judged on the basis of his integrity and his professional competence and not on the basis of membership in a lawful organization, nor a teacher's social, economic, political or religious opinions 'however difficult for others to understand and however distasteful to others they may be.'" (N. Y. Times, March 29, 1953). Dismissal could, in other words, only be justified, declared the Association's 1953 Convention, when a teacher "misuses his classroom or other relationships with his students for propaganda purposes, or for advocacy of legally defined subversive action, or in his extramural relationships is guilty of legally-defined subversive act." The resolution insisted, however, that "guilt must be established by evidence and the individual must receive the opportunity to defend himself."

Conservative Senator Robert A. Taft took the position that teachers should be judged by their actual teaching or classroom record and fitness—not by their private political ideology. Consequently Senator Taft did not think teachers should be fired solely because they were communists. Yet Senator Taft upheld the Congressional investigations of schools and teachers, failing to recognize that the investigators were not showing interest in the actual teaching or academic records of their victims, and also failing to see that the investigators are not qualified to evaluate or assess the teaching records in question.

Some professors and others of late have appealed to the 5th Amendment in order to refuse to answer Congressional Committee questions concerning their political views or affiliations. It is the only Amendment to which witnesses can appeal now without facing the danger of a jail sentence for contempt if they refuse to answer ideological questions posed by government committees. The National Convention of the AAUP opposed the dismissal of teachers solely because they have appealed to the 5th Amendment as a means of refusing to answer ideological questions. As put by Dr. Ralph Himstead, the Association's General Secretary, "Some people may feel that a teacher who refuses to answer has something to hide, but actually he may be exercising his constitutional right as a matter of principle because he does not think the committee has a right to ask that question." (NY Times 3-28-53.) One professor recently dismissed for standing on this Constitutional right is Prof. Barrows Dunham, Prof. of Philosophy at Temple University. He is author of "Man Against Myth," which we highly recommend to all socially-concerned followers of Jesus; it is available from MFSA's lending library.

Jesus and the UnRoman Activities Committee

Have we forgotten the stand taken by Jesus when quizzed as to his alleged UnRoman activities by investigators and courts in his day who were bent on sending him to death on a cross?

"Now the chief priests and the whole council sought to witness against Jesus to put him to death . . . And the High Priest stood up in the midst and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But he held his peace and answered nothing." (Mark 14:55, 60-61).

"And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest. And the Chief priests accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything." (Mark 15:2-5).

Was this Jesus' way of showing his contempt for the entire official investigations into his alleged unRoman activities? Was this Jesus' way of saying that his spirit and concepts and ideals were so utterly alien to those held by his inquisitors that anything he would say would be used against him?

Today Prof. Dunham and other of our contemporaries refuse to cooperate with the improper ideological investigations which threaten our liberties; and they pay a price for their refusal. Such non-cooperation with Congressional investigations is often misunderstood and condemned. But are we 1953 Christians sure that those who cooperate with the inquisitors today are as close to the position once taken by Jesus? Today we know about chief priests and Pilate not by virtue of their own greatness, but because of Him whom they condemned, and who resisted their inquisitions on behalf of the unjust status quo. In a less hysterical and more rational and democratic tomorrow, we or our children may honor not the petty inquisitors currently in seats of Congressional power, but the brave spirits like Philosophy Prof. Barrows Dunham who stand up against their freedom-threatening inquisitions.

A Comparison With England

While government officials and agents are probing into the political views of teachers across the US, England even under the Tories still holds to more old fashioned democratic concepts of political and academic freedom. Ian Mikardo, Labor Member of Parliament, in a recent Carnegie Hall address, reported that in England: "No teacher has ever been asked to state his political views."

In that kind of atmosphere it is possible for the secret ballot to continue to have some meaning.

Other Americans Fight Back

Even *Business Week* (March 4, 1953) criticized the treatment accorded victim witnesses in current committee probes saying that it "smacks of a medieval inquisition . . . a threat to our fundamental belief in freedom of thought which is essential to the continued progress of free enterprise."

The Amherst Alumni Association in Washington adopted a Declaration on Academic Freedom accusing "certain members of both Houses of Congress of desecrating our American traditions of intellectual honesty and fair play . . . If public opinion does not halt them, we believe they will be able to reduce education to ritualism and dogmatism."

In the House, two members (Emanuel Celler of NY and Roy Wier of Minn.) had the courage to vote against appropriations for the Un-American Activities Committee. Senator William Langer of North Dakota attended and addressed the Emergency Civil Liberties Conference in New York after it was smeared and attacked by ex-liberals turned witchhunters. Senator Lan-

ger announced in that address that he was creating a civil liberties Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee and that he would assume himself the Subcommittee Chairmanship. The purpose of that Committee (unlike that of other committees in our present Congress), would be to help stem current attacks on individual liberties. The hope would be that the new Committee would be in the progressive and democratic tradition of the old LaFollette Committee.

Our Basic Liberties in Grave Peril

The corrosion and destruction of our basic liberties is far advanced, and new steps toward the blackout of liberty have been taken during the past year. The March 28, 1953 NY Times stated "Reports alleging violations of academic freedom and of the rights of college instructors are 'swamping' the American Association of University Professors."

The McCarran-Walter Law

The greatest new legislative encroachment on civil liberties during the past year is the McCarran-Walter Law. Passed over President Truman's veto last June, the law came into effect on December 24, eve of the birthday of a foreign-born Asian child whom Christians have looked to as Saviour. It does more to discriminate against the foreign-born than any current act—adding over twenty legal grounds for deportation of the foreign-born and innumerable grounds for revoking the citizenship of naturalized citizens. As President Truman stated in his veto message "Some of these provisions would empower the Attorney General to deport any alien who has held a purpose to engage in activities 'prejudicial to the public interest' or 'subversive to the national security.' No standards or definitions are provided to guide discretion in the exercise of powers so sweeping. To punish undefined 'activities' departs from traditional American insistence on established standards of guilt. To punish an undefined 'purpose' is thought control." The President added, "These provisions are worse than the infamous Alien Act of 1798."

To facilitate deportation of the foreign-born, the McCarran-Walter Act abolishes present statutes of limitation in these cases. Foreign-born individuals can now be deported for acts alleged to have taken place fifty years ago. All grounds for deportation are made retroactive to cover all immigrants ever admitted to the USA. Some have concluded that the dead aliens are the only safe ones.

Among new grounds for deportation are such trivial ones as traffic offenses. (Sec. 241, a, 4).

This law denies to the foreign-born the traditional right to bail during the course of deportation proceedings. Until "final determination of deportability," however long that may take, the Attorney General may detain the resident alien. Indeed, at the Attorney General's uncurbed discretion, the resident alien may "be continued in custody" for six months after the final determination—and for an indefinite period thereafter if deportation cannot be effected. This seems to amount to a life sentence.

Traditionally, American seamen and seamen in general have enjoyed the right to shore leave in foreign ports. But the McCarran-Walter act severely restricts that right for foreign seamen. Thus hundreds of French seamen were denied shore leave in New York last Christmas because they would not satisfactorily answer questions as to their private political views and associations put to them by officials of a government not their own, (the USA under the McCarran-Walter Act.) Ironically, the seamen were on a ship named *Liberte*, and spent their Christmas in the harbor with the Statue of Liberty—gift of a freedom-loving France to a freedom-loving USA.

Our nation's prestige, therefore, reached a new low when the McCarran-Walter Act went into effect.

The Act has been assailed also by numerous churchmen, and by the distinguished Commission appointed by President Truman to study it, because of the racism reflected in its freezing of the present quota system. That system is based on national origins, and on the 1920 census, excluding Negroes, American Indians and other non-white persons in the population. This discriminates in favor of northern and western Europeans and against other Europeans and all non-whites. The Commission appointed by President Truman studied thoroughly the Act's provisions and concluded that it "Is an arrogant, brazen instrument of discrimination, based on race, creed, color and national origin."

President Eisenhower (and both parties) promised thorough revision of this undemocratic immigration law. Such revision would certainly seem to be called for if we take seriously the constant Old Testament theme of fairness and justice to the stranger within our gates, remembering that we too once were strangers in the land of Egypt. One of the tests which Jesus applied to the nations in his story of the last judgment had to do with treatment of aliens or strangers: "Before him shall be

gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separated the sheep from the goats . . . Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you . . . I was a stranger and ye took me in." (Math. 25:32, 34, 35).

Politicians in general seem to have a way of forgetting or ignoring their campaign promises—unless ordinary citizens are sufficiently interested and concerned to prevent this. We suggest that you write your Congressman and the President on the McCarran-Walter Act; we would appreciate a report of what you do.

A THOUGHT FOR THE EASTER SEASON

Mr. Gordon Dean, Chairman of the US Atomic Energy Commission began a recent address before the American Bar Association, as follows:

"It was a very wise Roman military writer who stated as long ago as the 4th century that 'he who would desire peace should be prepared for war.' It has taken the USA a good many decades and two vicious and devastating world wars to learn this basic lesson. But it now appears to be well learned—as witness the 85% of the federal budget related in one way or another to national defense."

One recalls in this Easter season that Roman soldiers nailed Jesus on a cross after he was sentenced to die there by the Roman governor, Pilate. Both Pilate and the Roman soldiers served the Roman empire and its "very wise Roman military" philosophy, which Jesus repudiated in his very last hours: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

If we are tempted by ancient Roman military philosophy, should we not remember the Roman Empire's ignominious fall? Will later empires, based on military philosophy, escape a similar destiny?

Do we really take seriously the Easter message as to who had the last word—Jesus and his idea, or the idea of the Roman military philosophy? Would we build our lives and that of our nation on an enduring basis? If so, shall we turn to the way of Jesus, or continue to follow the "wise Roman military writer" of the 4th Century and the 1953 architects of our federal warfare budget? Whom shall we really call our Prince of Peace: the war deity, Mars, or Jesus who came not with Operation Killer for North Koreans, or any people, but that they and we and all men "Might have life and have it more abundantly?"

JRM

OUR ECONOMY ANALYZED

"Nineteen Twenty-nine was the last year in which we enjoyed prosperity in a time of peace. From then until 1939, when World War II began, our economy showed no growth whatever in real output per person.

"The New Deal never actually solved the unemployment problem. In 1939, after seven years of New Deal doctoring, 9.5 million Americans were still out of work . . .

"Then came World War II. Under its stimulus, America's production soared and unemployment disappeared.

"World War II did what the New Deal was unable to do . . .

"Nearly one third of the high level production of the first five years after the war was due to making up the shortages created during the war—in automobiles, refrigerators, houses. Those things were largely paid for out of the \$140,000,000,000 savings which Americans had accumulated by the end of the war.

"Just as these war-bred shortages began to disappear, and the economy was beginning to weaken, along came Korea. Defense production again propped up the economy."

General Dwight D. Eisenhower, in speech in Peoria, Illinois, October 2, 1952.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year

25c per copy

Issued monthly, except July, August and September

METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION

(Unofficial)

President, Bishop Edgar A. Love; Vice-Presidents, Bishop J. W. E. Bowen and Rev. Edgar Wahlberg; Recording Secretary, Dr. Loyd Worley; Assistant Recording Secretary, Miss Janice M. Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Lee H. Ball; Assistant Treasurer, Mr. William W. Reid; Honorary Chairman, Bishop Francis J. McConnell.

Executive Secretary and Editor—JACK R. McMICHAE

Associate Secretaries: W. T. Brown, Mark Chamberlin.

Editorial Office and Office of Publication.

150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

Re-entered as second class matter Feb. 19, 1951, at the Postoffice at New York 11, N. Y., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

129

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

The first month of the new administration has extended the area of the attack on democratic rights.

The State Department, by bungling its response to McCarthy's demands concerning the Voice of America, has increased his power. Krock, New York Times chief Washington correspondent, figures that only five votes could now be found for implementing the former Senate committee conclusions that certain incidents in his career need further inquiry. A Times report from Europe says that this episode is worrying the most conservative of our supporters there. They fear the impact of government by committee, with the threat of imprisonment for contempt or perjury behind it, upon international relations.

The only word so far from the only man who could check this menacing development is that to limit congressional investigation is dangerous but it should be carried on with moderation. Another pointless generality. What is needed is a set of rules that would stop the ruining of reputations and careers by the use of proven and confessed perjurers with no opportunity for the victim to confront and cross-examine, that would keep investigations within the bounds of the Bill of Rights and accepted standards of fair play and decency.

The checks and balances of our constitutional system give the executive the duty to check usurpation and reverse unconstitutional action by the judicial and legislative departments, and to them the same duty regarding the executive department and each other. This duty was misinterpreted when the President refused to commute the death sentence of the Rosenbergs. The reason he gave the nation was that they had enjoyed the benefits of our courts, including the highest, and he was determined to fulfill his duty to uphold the process of justice. Two mis-statements. The Supreme Court refused to hear the case. The power of clemency was given him to correct, not uphold, errors of the courts and mistakes in the process of justice. The error was the refusal of the Supreme Court to hear. This nullified the constitutional prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. The President made himself accomplice in this nullification.

In defense of academic freedom Mrs. Agnes Meyer, director of the National Citizens Commission for Public Schools, wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, made a trenchant analysis of the methods and consequences of the current investigations, before the Association of School Administrators. She warned the educators that they would lose their integrity as well as their freedom if McCarthy, Velde, and Jenner (Committee Chairmen) were not stopped in their tracks. She said the university presidents could defeat the witch hunters if they would stand together and appeal to the nation. But not enough of them accept the principle affirmed by Senator Taft when he said: "I would not favor firing a communist professor unless he were shown to be teaching communism." Too many hold that a communist does not deserve freedom because he cannot himself have a free mind. Would they apply the same logic to Roman Catholics who also are under authority in certain fields?

Mrs. Meyer quickly became a victim of the "sort of reckless, irresponsible and false utterances" she said teachers are now facing. Velde, Committee Chairman, former F. B. I. officer, immediately charged her with expressing "admiration" for the Russian people in a letter to Soviet Russia Today, quoted by Pravda in '47. She promptly showed the letter was written by a Mrs. G. S. Mayer of Port Clemens, British Columbia, Canada. The Washington Post offered Velde the chance to withdraw his statement and quoted him as refusing unless Mrs. Meyer would withdraw her statements about him and Senator McCarthy.

Mrs. Meyer also warned the preachers that if educators lost the fight for freedom they would be the next to be attacked. The ground has been prepared. A large section of the public has been softened up for several years by articles against reds in the churches in national circulation magazines and daily papers. The attempted questioning of Rev. Stephen Fritchman in Los Angeles was a tryout by the Un-American Committee. Its 87 page Review of the M. F. S. A. distributed to General Conference delegates by the Circuit Riders was another. The date of the House action ordering printing—March 27-52—indicates the purpose. The Committee is starting to do with the freedom of religion clause in the First Amendment what it has already in large measure accomplished with freedom of speech—the restriction by extra-legal action which Congress is forbidden to do by law. Under the fraudulent excuse that it "has never attacked a church group as such and has no intention of doing so now" it has intervened in a religious dispute with intent to restrict freedom of expression for one side. This action should be officially resented and rebuked by our church in order that religion may be kept free to do its part in restoring freedom of press and assembly. Otherwise the strong declarations of principle by our Bishops and General Conference will in time become idle words.

H. F. W.